



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES & ENERGY
Oil, Gas & Mining

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

PAM
Scott M. Matheson, Governor
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director
Cleon B. Feight, Division Director

September 10, 1982

Mr. Ralph A. DeLeonardis
Permits Coordinator
White River Shale Oil Corporation
Suite 500, Prudential Building
115 South Main Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

RE: Condition #2
White River Approval
White River Shale Oil Project
ACT/047/017
Uintah County

Dear Ralph:

Pursuant to our September 9, 1982 phone conversation I would offer the following suggestions regarding the content of the "conclusive addendum package" due October 15, 1982. The contents of this package should include all approved final language. This may best be accomplished by including all finalized responses in addition to all approved language in the Phase I permit application.

Using the WRSOC system of dividing the Division Review letter of June 10, 1982 into Forty (40) items may be useful.

These 40 items may be broken down into the following groups:

- A. Those items DOGM signed off on in July 21, 1982 (#'s 1-6, 8, 13, 22, 24, 26, 39, a and b)
- B. Those that have been adequately addressed in the August 16, 1982 materials (37, 38, 39c)
- C. Those which were adequately addressed in the July 30 response from WRSOC (7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 19, 28, 32, 33, 35, 40)
- D. Those items for which definite deadlines have been arrived at:
14 (September 15, 1982)
11, 18, 34 (October 15, 1982)
- E. Items addressed in the approval letter of September 1, 1982. (23, 25, 30, 31, 36)

Mr. Ralph A. DeLeonardis
ACT/047/017
September 10, 1982
Page Two

F. Item still to be resolved - 12 (the permit holder should contact the Division regarding this)

G. Items where tentative deadlines have been arrived at.

11 (December 1985, December 1987)

16 (December 1985, December 1991)

H. Items where additional information is still required (23, 27, and 29)


Note: (See approval letter for #23)

(On 27 and 29 Sue Linner has contacted Kent Ostler on correcting language to correctly reflect bond release criteria)

The "conclusive addendum package" should include all final language of A, B, C and other groups above as applicable. It would be best to combine language which was approved in the original Phase I permit application as well to arrive with a finished product to date. Further, if this is not possible, the response appearing in the addendum should be referenced to the applicable section in the Phase I permit application. An appendix containing all attendant correspondence in chronological order should be included with the addendum.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,



THOMAS L. PORTLE
RECLAMATION SOILS SPECIALIST

TLP:sc

cc: Tom Tetting, OGM
Sue Linner, OGM
Pam Grubaugh-Littig, OGM